

Revisiting the thorny issue of missing values in single-cell proteomics

Christophe Vanderaa ¹ and Laurent Gatto ¹ 

¹Computational Biology and Bioinformatics Unit (CBIO), de Duve Institute, UCLouvain, Belgium

Abstract

Missing values are a notable challenge when analysing mass spectrometry-based proteomics data. While the field is still actively debating on the best practices, the challenge increased with the emergence of mass spectrometry-based single-cell proteomics and the dramatic increase in missing values. A popular approach to deal with missing values is to perform imputation. Imputation has several drawbacks for which alternatives exist, but currently imputation is still a practical solution widely adopted in single-cell proteomics data analysis. This perspective discusses the advantages and drawbacks of imputation. We also highlight 5 main challenges linked to missing value management in single-cell proteomics. Future developments should aim to solve these challenges, whether it is through imputation or data modelling. The perspective concludes with recommendations for reporting missing values, for reporting methods that deal with missing values and for proper encoding of missing values.

Introduction

The hurdles associated with missing values are a recurring issue in data analysis and concern a wide range of fields and applications [1]. The handling of missing values in mass spectrometry (MS)-based proteomics is still actively debated [2, 3, 4]. While elucidating the best computational approaches to manage missing values is going on, the field continues pushing the boundaries of low input acquisitions. Recent technical advances in MS have paved the way for MS-based single-cell proteomics (SCP) [5, 6, 7, 8, 9], but handling missing values in SCP data is still a clear challenge to principled data analysis [10]. We are confident that the number of missing values will decrease as future technologies will improve sensitivity [5, 11, 12, 13], but missing values will always remain unavoidable. It is therefore important to not only think about how to limit them but also how to deal with them during data analysis. In this perspective, we open the discussion on how to manage missing values in SCP data. We build our perspective on a combination of computational advances in MS-based proteomics and in single-cell RNA sequencing (scRNA-Seq). On the one hand, scRNA-Seq is a prolific field with respect to computational method development dedicated to single-cell data [14], and we foresee that many of these efforts and tools will inspire the field of SCP. However, handling missing values in SCP data differs from scRNA-Seq by the presence of strong batch effects, the current lack of standardized protocols leading to a variety of data types, and the fact the mechanisms that generate missing values are inherently different (count-based versus intensity-based measures). On the other hand, MS-based proteomics already tackled many computational hurdles associated with managing missing values [2]. SCP inherits from the challenges of bulk proteomics, but these are strongly exacerbated. While bulk proteomics datasets rarely show more than 50 % missing values [2], over 75 % missing values is the rule for SCP datasets (*Figure 1*). Moreover, strong batch effects occur for large-scale proteomics studies and require dedicated experimental

 **For correspondence:** Laurent Gatto laurent.gatto@uclouvain.be

Present address: Computational Biology Unit (CBIO), de Duve Institute - UCLouvain, Avenue Hippocrate 75, 1200 Brussels, Belgium

Data availability: All peptide data were retrieved from the `scpdata` package available on [Bioconductor](#). The data package directly offers quantification values at precursor, peptide and/or protein level. The code to reproduce the images presented in the manuscript is available in the Github repository: [UCLouvain-CBIO/2023_scp_na](#).

Funding: This work was funded by a research fellowship of the Fonds de la Recherche Scientifique-FNRS.

Competing interests: The authors declare no competing interests.

Keywords: Single-cell, Mass spectrometry, Proteomics, RNA-Seq, Data analysis, Missing values, Imputation, Reproducible research.

arXiv:2304.06654v3 [q-bio.QM] 11 Jul 2023




Figure 1. Cumulative percentage of missing values for different SCP datasets. Each line (coloured by dataset) depicts what percentage of the peptides are retained if we tolerate a given percentage of missing values. For example (red circle), in the brunner2022 dataset, allowing at most 75 % missing values would boil down to keeping only 50 % of all peptides in the dataset.

Figure 1—source data 1. All data were retrieved from the `scpdata` package [16] and systematically processed using the same minimal workflow. Briefly, we start from the quantified peptide to spectrum match or precursor data and keep only samples that correspond to a single cell. We then remove any feature that is a contaminant, matches a decoy peptide, or has an associated false discovery rate > 1%. We then encode all zeros as missing values and filter out features that are missing for all cells. Finally, we compute the percentage of missing values for each peptide (a peptide is missing in a cell if all the corresponding intensities at the precursor level are missing). The percentages are ordered by increasing values. The percentage of peptides is computed as the rank of the percentage of missing values divided by the total number of peptides. Reference to the source data, in the order they appear in the legend: [17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24]

and computational efforts to enable reproducible results [15]. SCP experiments are large-scale studies since they require thousands of cells acquired over at least hundreds of MS acquisitions. Finally, a major difference between SCP and bulk proteomics is that SCP analyses can no longer rely on replicates because every cell is unique.

Throughout the paper, we will illustrate our perspective using published datasets retrieved from `scpdata`, an R/Bioconductor data package. `scpdata` provides quantitative data along with feature and sample annotations at precursor, peptide and/or protein level. We will start by discussing the advantages and pitfalls of imputation and highlight alternative approaches to deal with missing values. Next, we describe the main challenges that future computational development should aim to solve when dealing with missing values in SCP data. Finally, we will finish by providing recommendations on how to report the sensitivity and consistency of an SCP experiment in terms of missing values, how to report the approach used to deal with these missing values, and how to encode missing values during data analysis.

To impute or not to impute?

Ideally, one should avoid imputation when performing SCP data analysis (**Table 1**). Imputation of missing values using an unsuitable model can lead to biased estimates and introduces false signal [25, 26, 27, 28, 29]. Which model is suitable for which type of data is still actively benchmarked and debated in the fields of scRNA-Seq and bulk proteomics [27, 3]. In scRNA-Seq, imputation can

have dramatic effects on clustering and leads to strong artifacts in the gene expression landscape depicted by t-SNE or UMAP projections [30, 27]. Another argument against imputation is that imputation methods may cause over-smoothing [26], i.e. they remove biological heterogeneity because they directly or indirectly combine observed values. This means that any prediction is bound within the observed entries and artificially increase the homogeneity across cells [10, 28]. The issue of over-smoothing is of particular concern for scRNA-Seq. Numerous methods have been developed in an attempt to conserve the cell-to-cell relationships to identify rare cell subpopulations [26, 27, 30]. Another important limitation is that imputation is an estimation process with inherent uncertainty. Replacing missing values with a single point estimate ignores the variability associated with the estimation process [27, 28]. For instance, highly parameterized imputation methods may lead to over-fitting that is characterized by high variance in the prediction [31]. Multiple imputation approaches attempt to tackle this issue by computing multiple predictions for each entry. These predictions are then summarized, typically by averaging, leading to estimates that are more robust than using a single prediction [32, 33]. Furthermore, the variance associated with each imputation and across imputations can be combined and used for downstream analysis [34], although this substantially complicates the analytical approach. The performance of multiple imputation however still relies on the performance of the underlying imputation method used [35] and does not solve systematic bias. Finally, imputation can mask contrasts that are inestimable [28]. Protein quantities are derived from peptide intensities. However, peptides are often quantified in a limited fraction of the cells. When two groups of cells share no quantified peptides and there is no third group of cells that expresses these peptides to serve as a reference, the contrast is considered inestimable. Imputation will artificially fill the gaps and mask these inestimable contrasts, leading to highly biased estimates [28]. We also emphasize that aggregation of peptides intensities to protein intensities in the presence of missing values leads to implicit imputation [35]. For example, aggregating peptides using the median expression implicitly assumes that the missing values equal the estimated median. Another example is the aggregation of peptides using the sum. This will implicitly impute missing values by zero. Implicit imputation suffers from the same drawbacks mentioned above but occurs unnoticed and hence undocumented.

Table 1. Arguments against and for imputation.

To impute or not to impute?	
No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Imputation introduces bias • Imputation artificial increases homogeneity across samples • Imputation omits the variance associated to the estimation process • Imputation masks inestimable contrasts
Alternatives	Use methods that can account for missing values: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Models dedicated to differential analysis: SMP, hurdle model • Dimension reduction as start point for downstream analyses: NIPALS, missMDA • All-in-one models: ZINB-WaVE, scVI (only scRNA-Seq)
Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Imputation unlocks many computational tools that break upon missing values • Imputation is easier to develop and assess as a separate step • Imputation is easily transferable across fields

An alternative approach to imputation is to apply models that account for missing values. In proteomics for example, the selection model for proteomics (SMP, [28]) or the hurdle model [29] are models that contain a component for modelling peptide abundance and another to model peptide missing rates while taking into account sample and batch effects. While both models provide a compelling solution to missing data for proteomics, it only applies to label-free experiments and can only be applied to a single task, differential analysis. Single-cell downstream analyses also typically include clustering, dimension reduction or trajectory inference [36, 37]. Moreover, SMP is based on a Bayesian framework optimized through Gibb's sampling, and the hurdle model is fit using a mixed model framework. Hence, these methods will unlikely scale to large SCP datasets. Another solution is to rely on dimension reduction output, such as principal component analysis (PCA), to perform the downstream analysis tasks. Alternating least squares algorithms such as NIPALS or regularized expectation maximization (EM-)PCA algorithms such as missMDA are two approaches that perform PCA in the presence of missing values [38]. However, the former may suffer from numerical instability and the latter is computationally expensive and does not scale for large SCP datasets. Moreover, both approaches assume the missing value pattern is random, which does not hold for both proteomics and scRNA-Seq data [33, 28, 31], and especially for SCP [10]. Different methods have been developed for scRNA-Seq data to tackle these limitations. For instance, the ZINB-WaVE and scVI are modelling approaches that perform dimension reduction while accounting for missing values, batch effects and normalization [39, 40]. These models also go beyond dimension reduction. ZINB-WaVE estimates the probability that missing entries follow a negative binomial distribution. The probabilities can be used to leverage bulk differential analysis tools [41]. scVI directly integrates an inference step in its approach enabling the assessment of statistical differences between subpopulations of interest.

Although imputation should ideally be avoided, many SCP analyses include imputation in their workflow [16]. The reasons are mainly practical (**Table 1**). First, many downstream methods cannot directly deal with missing values. The tools that implement them either return an error when missing values are present or will output unusable results because the missing values are propagated to every entry of the data. Using a suitable imputation method to predict missing values unlocks these methods. Another reason is that it can be included as a standalone step in a workflow. Although it is wrong to assume that imputation is independent of other processing steps such as normalization or batch correction [10], it dramatically facilitates the assessment of its performance [27, 42]. This assessment is much harder for methods such as ZINB-WaVE or scVI where the quality of the outcome will depend on the different components of the model without the possibility to pinpoint performance bottlenecks. Also, different data require different imputation methods. For instance, Hou et al. [27] and Kong et al. [2] provide decision trees for which imputation method to select given data characteristics for scRNA-Seq and proteomics, respectively. Hence, allowing to easily plug a different imputation method in a workflow is easier and quicker than developing a new model tailored for each data type and analysis task at hand. Finally, imputation methods can easily be transferred and reassessed across fields. For instance, K-nearest neighbour (KNN) imputation is an imputation method used in a wide range of application and fields [43] and has been rapidly adopted by the SCP field that still lacks dedicated models to handle missing values [16].

In conclusion, we recommend avoiding imputation, but in practice, this can be difficult to achieve. Suitable methods to handle missing values are still to be developed for SCP. While imputation leads to inaccuracies, it still leverages useful information from complex data [27]. In the following section, we list five main challenges that should be considered when developing imputation methods or models that handle missing values for SCP data.

Challenges in managing missing values in SCP data

Challenge 1: High proportion of missing values

The first challenge is to cope with high proportions of missing values (**Table 2**). A typical SCP dataset can contain on average between 50 and 90 % missing values. In the context of scRNA-Seq, most imputation methods exhibit a decreased performance for transcripts with high proportions of missing values [30]. This is expected since, on the one hand, fewer data are available to predict the missing value and, on the other hand, more bias is introduced by performing more estimations. Up to now, the methods used to impute SCP data were taken from the proteomics field [16], but their suitability to single-cell data needs to be evaluated. The performance of imputation methods on bulk data has been evaluated on datasets with, relatively, low numbers of samples and missing value proportions of about 20 to 50 % [2, 3, 35, 44]. Another question raised by the high proportion of missing values in SCP data is how to perform peptide or protein filtering. Bulk proteomics pipelines often remove highly missing peptides, usually allowing at most 90 % of missing values [2]. Depending on the SCP datasets, this filter can lead to removing between 50 and 80 % of all quantified peptides (**Figure 1**). One challenge is therefore to leverage useful information from these highly missing peptides. Another challenge is that the performance of imputation methods depends on the proportions of missing values. Kong et al. [2] suggest different methods for imputing missing values based on the proportion of missing values. This is also observed for scRNA-Seq. In this context, Leote, Wu, and Beyer [30] conclude that “there is no universally best-performing method that outperforms the others in all cases”. Therefore, they propose an ensemble approach where the best imputation method is selected for each transcript separately using a cross-validation approach. We expect this relationship between the accuracy of imputation (or data modelling) and the proportion of missing values to hold for SCP, and ensemble approaches may offer an interesting framework to tackle this challenge.

Table 2. Summary of the main challenges in managing missing values in SCP data.

Challenges	
High proportion of missing values	SCP data contain between 50 and 90 % missing values. This leads to decreased imputation performance and requires to reassess the thresholds used for filtering peptides or proteins based on the proportion of missing values.
Different types of data	SCP data can be acquired using DIA or DDA approaches, LFQ or multiplexed protocols, using orbitraps or time of flight. The diversity of technologies leads to different missing value patterns.
Cell to cell heterogeneity	Every cell is unique, hence no technical replicates are available. Several methods already tackle this challenge when imputing scRNA-Seq data: MAGIC, scISR, Network.
Strong batch effects	SCP data is acquired through hundreds of MS runs, leading to inevitable batch effects both on the identification and the quantification. The RUV-III-C method is a promising approach, provided adaptation to SCP data.
Different causes of missing values	Values may be missing because of MNAR or MCAR mechanisms. Most methods to deal with missing values are tailored towards one or the other mechanism. A potential solution is to apply cross-validated ensemble approaches, as suggested for scRNA-Seq, or relying on probability estimations, as suggested for bulk proteomics.

Challenge 2: Different types of data

The second challenge is the diversity of data acquisition protocols and instruments to perform SCP (*Table 2*). For instance, we can classify protocols as label-free (LFQ) or as multiplexed (TMT, mTRAQ). LFQ experiments acquire one cell per MS run, while multiplexed experiments acquire from 3 to 18 cells per MS run. These two protocols lead to different correlation structures and batch effects in the data. Furthermore, samples processed by either of these two protocols can be acquired using data-dependent acquisition (DDA) or data-independent acquisition (DIA). Also, DDA can be targeted towards specific peptides known to be present in a sample by using a prioritized inclusion list for MS2 selection [45, 20]. A thorough description of the different technologies for acquiring SCP data is provided by others [6]. These protocols, in combination with the instruments to run them, generate different types of data and lead to different patterns of missing values, implying that different imputation assumptions and algorithms might be required. This is not specific to SCP. In bulk proteomics, benchmarking efforts and literature reviews focus on one type of data. For instance, Kong et al. [2] focus on DDA LFQ data, Bramer et al. [3] focus on DDA TMT data and Dabke et al. [4] focused on LFQ DIA data. Hence, the development and validation of SCP imputation methods should be dataset-specific.

Challenge 3: Cell to cell heterogeneity

The imputation method should ideally account for cell-to-cell heterogeneity (*Table 2*). Each single cell is a unique sample, hence no technical replication is possible [46]. Solutions to this challenge have been explored in the field scRNA-Seq. For instance, MAGIC [47] improves upon sample-wise KNN imputation by taking into account the similarity between cells (we will discuss the meaning of sample-wise KNN in the next section). When imputing a value with sample-wise KNN, we first search a discrete set of K cells that are closely related to the cell to impute. The average of these neighbouring cells provides the imputation estimate. The number of neighbours K will influence the imputation results. We have previously shown that KNN imputation on SCP data can lead to exceedingly smooth profiles for highly missing peptides or proteins [10]. Instead of searching for a discrete set of neighbours, MAGIC computes the probability of transitioning from one cell to another and uses the probabilities as weights to estimate the missing value for a given cell. This approach takes into account that each cell is different and may contribute differently to the imputation process. However, MAGIC borrows information from cell-cell relationships, hence it can potentially influence these relationships for downstream analysis, such as clustering of trajectory inference. A similar imputation approach is to predict missing values using gene-gene relationships, as implemented in the scISR or the Network algorithms [26, 30]. The drawback of these methods is that building a reliable gene network is difficult and either relies on fully observed genes [26] or on external bulk data [30].

Challenge 4: Strong batch effects

The fourth challenge is the presence of strong batch effects in SCP data (*Table 2*). SCP experiments contain hundreds to thousands of cells that must be analysed over many MS runs. Slight differences in experimental conditions across MS acquisitions influence the identification and quantification of peptides [28]. We also observe a strong influence of batch effects on peptide quantification and missing rate [10]. An imputation method for SCP should account for batch effects as well. The ProNorm method was designed to account for these effects in the context of large bulk proteomics datasets acquired using a DIA approach [15]. ProNorm first removes batch effects using the RUV-III-C model and then performs imputation by sampling from a normal distribution centred around the average of the batch-corrected replicates. The method has however several drawbacks when applied to single-cell data. First, it relies on the presence of replicates. As stated above, we can no longer rely on replicates with single-cell data. Second, the model also relies on negative controls, i.e. peptides that are known to be constant across cells. The presence of such negative controls is again a strong assumption in the context of single cells given the presence of cell-to-cell

heterogeneity. Finally, the RUV-III-C model is specifically designed to remove any variance that is not associated with biological factors and/or experimental conditions of interest. In other words, RUV-III-C removes any variability that is not explained by the experimental design. This property is not desirable for single-cell analyses as the main objective is to leverage unexplained variance, for instance, to discover rare cell states or continuous differentiation processes that are blurred by bulk approaches. This method could be adapted to SCP similarly to how ZINB-WaVE adapted the RUV model to scRNA-Seq data [39].

Challenge 5: Different causes of missing values

The fifth challenge is to account for the different mechanisms that generate missing values (*Table 2*). There are 2 types of mechanisms: biological missingness and technical missingness. A peptide or protein is biologically missing from a cell if that cell does not express the feature. A peptide or protein is technically missing from a cell if the instrument or the computational workflow was not able to detect and quantify the feature. Biological and technical missingness bear different information and distinguishing the two leads to biologically meaningful insights [29]. However, this distinction is difficult to assess accurately and formulate mathematically. Instead, the proteomics field often classifies missing values as missing completely at random (MCAR) and missing not at random (MNAR) [2, 35]. MCAR means that the process that generated the missing value is completely random and unrelated to the true underlying value. Conversely, MNAR means that the missing value probability is dependent on the underlying value. In other words, a peptide may be MNAR because its corresponding protein is not present in a cell or at levels that fall below the MS2 threshold for selection (DDA) or limit of detection of the instrument. A peptide may be MCAR because of instrumental artefacts (e.g. slight variation in ionization efficiency) or computational limitations (e.g. poor identification score). Different imputation algorithms are required to correctly impute MNAR or MCAR values [2, 35]. For instance, the sampling from a down-shifted normal distribution imputation approach is recommended for missing values that exhibit MNAR properties, while a dimension reduction-based imputation is recommended when the missing values are MCAR [2]. However, SCP datasets and more generally large proteomics datasets exhibit both MCAR and MNAR in unknown proportions [10, 3, 44]. In line with the second challenge, the prevalence of MNAR and MCAR will depend on the type of datasets, but it will also depend on the nature of the peptide and protein analysed [48, 33, 28]. This complicates the development and assessment of imputation methods. A solution is to estimate the proportion of MNAR and MCAR using probability theory, as already explored for bulk proteomics [48, 49, 33]. Giai Gianetto et al. [33] suggest a multiple imputation framework where estimated MCAR/MNAR probabilities are used to stochastically select an MCAR- or MNAR-devoted imputation algorithm. Ahlmann-Eltze and Anders [49], and more recently Li and Smyth [48], developed a statistical approach where detection probabilities are estimated using a logistic regression model to infer the bias caused by ignoring MNAR. Both models assume a strong relationship between detection probability and measured intensities and were developed for label-free data. However, multiplexing is foreseen to play an important role in achieving the high sample throughput required for single-cell applications [11, 13]. We do not find empirical evidence of such a relationship in SCP data, especially for multiplexed datasets (*Figure 2*). Future efforts should consider cell-to-cell heterogeneity and batch effects when deciphering the missing data mechanisms in SCP data.

We addressed the challenges separately, but in practice, new imputation methods or modelling approaches for SCP data should address these simultaneously. Therefore, we expect that more complex algorithms than those currently used for SCP data processing will be required. These challenges are currently overwhelming and hard to tackle, but we are optimistic. We foresee that future advances in the technologies and search engines will reduce the number of missing values generated in single cells [11, 50, 12]. Hence, tackling these challenges will become easier with time as the quality of the data to impute will improve.




Figure 2. Relationship between detection probability and observed peptide intensity. The relationships are shown for 4 representative SCP datasets: brunner2022 (a, LF-DIA), derks2022 (b, mTRAQ-DIA), leduc2022 (c, TMT-DDA) and schoof2021 (d, TMT-DDA). Each point represents a peptide in the dataset. Peptide intensities are estimated as the average of the log intensities across all cells (ignoring missing values) as suggested by Li and Smyth [48]. The proportion of detection is the number of samples where the peptide is observed divided by the total number of samples. The red line represents the fitted detection probability curve and was estimated using the `proADP` R package [48]. The poor fit indicates the relationship between detection probability and observed peptide intensity is weak for SCP data. **Figure 2—source data 1.** All data were retrieved from the `scpdata` package [16] and systematically processed using the same minimal workflow. Briefly, we start from the quantified peptide to spectrum match or precursor data and keep only samples that correspond to a single cell. We then remove any feature that is a contaminant, matches a decoy peptide, or has an associated false discovery rate > 1%. We then encode all zeros as missing values and filter out features that are missing for all cells. Data were further log-transformed. When multiple precursors map to the same peptide, the intensities are aggregated using the median. The logistic regression curves were fit using the `stats::glm()` function in R.

Recommendations for managing missing values in SCP data

In this section, we extend the initial recommendations recently published for performing, benchmarking, and reporting SCP experiments [46], focusing on reporting missing values and the methods to manage them. We will also discuss how to encode missing values in SCP data.

Reporting sensitivity and consistency

Missing values and sensitivity are two sides of the same coin. If a technology had perfect sensitivity, no missing data would be generated other than biologically missing values. We here define sensitivity as the number of distinct peptide or protein identifications. To facilitate the discussion, we will not distinguish between sensitivity at the peptide or protein level because they show the same trends, and we will refer to features instead. Sensitivity is commonly reported as the number of features per cell [18, 51, 52, 20, 17]. We call this metric the *local sensitivity* (**Figure 3a**, dashed line, and b). Local sensitivity is computed for each cell, hence this metric should be summarised with the mean and standard deviation. While technological developments aim to maximize local sensitivity, it should be interpreted with care. Solely looking at the local sensitivity does not provide the full picture of the number of features that can be detected in an experiment. Every cell is unique, and every run is subject to technical variations that influence feature identification. So, we do not expect to find all detectable features by looking at individual cells. Therefore, we recommend also reporting sensitivity as the total number of distinct features identified across the whole experiment. We call this the *total sensitivity* (**Figure 3a**, solid line, c). It allows a more accurate estimation of how many features a given experiment can potentially detect in low-amount samples. Total sensitivity has also associated caveats. When reporting total sensitivity, we assume that enough cells were acquired to capture all detectable features. This is the case for the CD38 negative blast cells acquired by Schoof et al. [22]. By including thousands of cells in their experiment, the authors were able to reach a saturation of the set of identified peptides (**Figure 3a**). If they had limited their analysis to less than 500 blast cells, they would have underestimated the total sensitivity. This is the case for leukaemic stem cells, which are scarcer than blast cells. About a hundred stem cells do not allow to reach the total sensitivity for that cell type. We expect that reaching total sensitivity will be difficult for rare cell populations and will offer a solution later in the section.

Although local and total sensitivity are useful metrics when reported together, they provide no information about the consistency of identification. Consistency of identification relates to the similarity between sets of features identified across different cells [50]. Consistency of identification between cells has previously been reported using Venn diagrams, or upset plots [18, 52, 51, 10, 21, 19]. These approaches nevertheless limit the comparison to tens of single cells, otherwise, these visualizations become difficult to interpret. We recommend instead to report the *data completeness*. Data completeness is the proportion of observed values across the dataset. It relies on the fact that the lower the consistency between cells, the more missing values will be incorporated in the dataset, hence the lower the data completeness. As soon as a cell with new features is added to a dataset, these new features will introduce missing values for the other cells and therefore decrease the data completeness. But again, reporting only the data completeness is not sufficient. It provides no information about sensitivity. For instance, the Liang et al. dataset showed a relatively high data completeness (hence high consistency), but at the expense of a limited number of features (low total sensitivity, **Figure 3b**, **Figure 3c**). Another drawback is that data completeness depends on the accurate estimation of the total sensitivity, hence the need to acquire a sufficient number of cells. The Liang et al. dataset is composed of only three single cells and hence underestimates the total sensitivity. This explains the apparently high but biased data completeness.

In conclusion, we suggest reporting at least the local sensitivity, the total sensitivity, the data completeness and the number of cells included in the dataset. No useful assessment of sensitivity and consistency is possible without reporting these four metrics together. They are simple to implement and do not require complex data analysis. These metrics represent an objective

way to compare different parameters in an SCP experiment that may affect sensitivity and consistency, such as sample preparation protocols, MS settings or peptide identification software. Only one of these parameters should be varied if the objective is to compare performance. Therefore, **Figure 3c** cannot be used to suggest the superior performance of a protocol over the others because the datasets contain different cell types, they were acquired with different instruments, and they were processed with different search engines. Still, we can see a correlation between the local sensitivity and the data completeness, indicating that increased sensitivity allows retrieving more of the same features across cells. We also recommend computing these metrics for the full dataset and for each cell type separately (defined in the experimental design or after data analysis). Different cell types express different sets of peptides in different quantities which will inevitably influence the sensitivity. Finally, we focus the discussion solely on reporting the sensitivity of identification. We refer to the initial recommendations for a thorough discussion about the assessment of the quantitative data [46], and we refer to the recent review by Boekweg and Payne [50] for recommendations about the computational challenges for peptide and protein quantification in SCP data.

We next extend upon the four metrics with two more advanced concepts that may be harder to implement.

First, we recommend testing whether the number of cells is sufficient to accurately assess the total sensitivity. We suggest reporting a cumulative sensitivity plot (**Figure 3a**), where the sensitivity is reported as a function of the number of cells. To build this graph, we randomly sample an increasing number of cells from the dataset and compute the sensitivity for each pool. We suggest performing several draws with the same number of cells to include an estimation of the variance associated with the stochastic selection process. The sensitivity is expected to plateau at the total sensitivity as we include more cells (**Figure 3a**). This can be modelled using an asymptotic regression model. In case the total sensitivity is not achieved, the total sensitivity may be extrapolated using the fitted model asymptote (**Figure 3a**, red line).

Second, inspired by the quality assessment by Derks et al. [18], we also recommend reporting the Jaccard index between all possible pairs of cells within a cell type (**Figure 3d**). The Jaccard index measures the overlap between the sets of features identified from 2 cells. Contrarily to the data completeness, the Jaccard index no longer depends on the total sensitivity. However, computing the Jaccard index between all pairs of cells is more elaborate and is best performed using a programming language such as R or Python.

Reporting methods for missing values

The minimal requirement for reporting an imputation method or a missing data model approach is to provide the name of the algorithm used, the name of the software that implements it and the version of that software. We stress that these three elements are the bare minimum for a meaningful and useful method report. Reporting the software version is critical, because different versions of the same software may add, remove or update functionality, hence possibly changing the output. Next to reporting the version, we have seen Method sections that solely report a piece of software or an algorithm [16]. This leads to ambiguity since software often implement several algorithms, and an algorithm is often implemented by multiple pieces of software. For instance, `VIM (R)`, `impute (R)` and `sklearn (python)` offer functionality to perform KNN imputation. These three pieces of software offer different parameters (and default values), perform different optimizations, solve edge cases differently, and have different assumptions about the data. We experienced the impact of these differences when replicating published SCP data analyses [10]. Specht et al. [23] performed KNN imputation using their own implemented in R. We observed significant numerical differences when comparing their processed data tables to those generated by our R/Bioconductor package `scp` [10]. After inspection, we were able to identify the origin of the problem. The reimplementation by Specht performs sample-wise KNN (i.e. infers missing values from closely related cells), while our `scp` package relies on the `impute.knn` function from the R package `impute` that




Figure 3. Reporting sensitivity. **a.** Cumulative sensitivity curve showing the total number of distinct peptides as we sample an increasing number of CD38- blast cells (yellow) or leukaemic stem cells (LCS, brown) from the Schoof et al. dataset. The dashed line represents the local sensitivity, that is the average sensitivity of a single cell. The solid grey line is the total sensitivity. The solid red line shows the fit of the asymptotic regression model for the LSC data, with extrapolation. **b.** The median local sensitivity with respect to data completeness. Each point is a cell type, coloured according to the corresponding dataset, and sized according to the number of cells acquired. The vertical lines represent the standard deviation. Empty diamonds indicate the dataset average. **c.** Total number of distinct peptides found in various cell types grouped by dataset (colour). **d.** Distribution of the pairwise Jaccard index within each cell type for each dataset.

Figure 3—source data 1. All data were retrieved from the `scpdata` package [16] and systematically processed using the same minimal workflow. Briefly, we start from the quantified peptide to spectrum match or precursor data and keep only samples that correspond to a single cell. We then remove any feature that is a contaminant, matches a decoy peptide, or has an associated false discovery rate > 1%. We then encode all zeros as missing values and filter out features that are missing for all cells. We then build the identification matrix where rows correspond to peptides and columns to single cells, and entries are 1 if the peptide was found in the corresponding cell and 0 otherwise. The matrix is then split based on the cell type. Metrics are computed as follows. The number of cells is the number of columns of the matrix. The local sensitivity is the sum by column. The total sensitivity is the number of rows and the data completeness is the average of the matrix. Jaccard indexes are computed for each pair of columns as the size of the union of peptides divided by the size of the intersection. The cumulative sensitivity plot was constructed from the identification matrix as described in the body of the text. References to the source data, in the order they appear in the legend: [17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24]

performs variable-wise KNN (i.e. infers missing values from closely related peptides or proteins). **Figure 4** shows the impact of both KNN approaches on cell and protein correlations. Because sample-wise KNN borrows information from other cells, it will on average increase correlations between cells (**Figure 4a** and **c**). Conversely, variable-wise KNN will remove correlation between cells because it focuses on the relationships between features. We also observe a small impact on protein correlations (**Figure 4b**). We observe a reduction in the protein correlations after both sample-wise and feature-wise KNN imputation, but we also notice a subtle but systematic shift towards higher correlation when imputing with sample-wise KNN. Since the proportion of missing values vary drastically across proteins, we binned the protein correlation based on their percentage of missing values (**Figure 4d**). KNN imputation, both sample-wise and variable-wise, has little impact on correlation distribution when proteins have less than 20 % missing values (**Figure 4d**, top). This is expected since fewer predictions are required. As more observations are missing, the protein correlations before imputation become inaccurate. Sample-wise KNN imputation of highly missing proteins restores the correlation distributions centred around zero, as seen when proteins are less missing. Variable-wise KNN leads to correlation distributions that are sharper and progressively shifted towards higher correlations as the percentage of missing values increases.

Sample-wise and variable-wise KNN rely on different assumptions leading to numerical differences that will propagate through the data processing workflow. In theory, sample-wise KNN leads to a violation of the sample independence assumption on which most statistical methods rely. Similarly, the same violation occurs for proteins when combining variable-wise KNN and statistical methods to infer regulatory protein networks. However, how these violations impact the statistical outcome in practice is still to be explored.

To conclude, we strongly recommend reporting the missing value management approach by mentioning the algorithm, the name of the software and its version together. However, we stress that the best practice is to provide the code (e.g. scripts, Rmarkdown files or Jupyter notebooks) that generates the published results along with the computational environment containing all the software tools in the state that they were used to run the code [46].

Encoding missing values

Unobserved entries in scRNA-Seq data are encoded as zeros. This is because RNA-Seq is a count-based approach where zero is a meaningful readout. Proteomics experiments, however, are based on methods that measure electrical current intensities. In the absence of any signal, MS instruments still record noise levels as low values, but zeros are not expected to occur. Any zero present in SCP data is generated computationally, either because the intensities below a given threshold were trimmed to zero or because quantifications for unobserved peptides or proteins were filled with zeros when joining multiple samples together. Since these computationally derived zeros are not meaningful, we recommend replacing them with a dedicated data type, such as the `NA` value in R or the `numpy.nan` value in Python. Larger datasets will require sparse data representations that are crucial for managing and handling the data with limited computational resources. These data representations, such as those implemented in the `Matrix` R package or the `scipy.sparse` Python module assume the missing entries are zeros. Future large-scale analyses might make use of sparse representations to support efficient data storage. Zeros should then be considered placeholders that are disregarded during data processing and downstream analyses. Otherwise, this would boil down to an implicit zero imputation that is likely ill-suited for SCP data [2, 35]. We suggest future computational tools for SCP data to handle missing values and zero values with great care.

Conclusion

Handling missing values in SCP can be an intimidating task. We prefer to avoid imputing missing values, but unfortunately no alternatives have yet been suggested that are easily applicable to SCP.




Figure 4. Sample-wise and variable-wise KNN are not the same. **a.** Distribution of Pearson correlations computed for each pair of cells. Data were either not imputed (none), sample-wise KNN imputed or variable-wise KNN imputed. Note that the observed values before imputation are not modified after imputation. Points highlight the median of the distribution. **b.** Same as a., but for protein correlation. **c.** The correlations in a. are shown for pairs of cells within a cell type, that is melanoma (red) or monocyte (blue). **d.** The correlations in b. are separated into 5 groups of proteins depending on the percentage of missing values. Groups are ordered from lowly missing (dark green) to highly missing (pale yellow). The data are taken from Leduc et al. [20].

Figure 4—source data 1. The nPOP data [20] were retrieved from the `scpdata` package [10]. We took the protein data processed before imputation [16]. To avoid complicating the interpretation with confounding effects, we remove batch effect using the `removeBatchEffect` algorithm from the `limma` R package (version 3.55.1). Note that we do not recommend this approach for SCP data analysis (c.f. fourth challenge). Next, we impute the protein data using the `impute` function from the `QFeatures` package (version 1.9.2). We used the KNN algorithm with $K = 15$, ensuring that every entry is imputed with KNN, regardless of the proportion of missing values (`rowmax = 1`, `colmax = 1`) and disabling computational shortcuts (`maxp = Inf`). Pairwise correlation per cell and per protein were then computed. When two cells have the same type, their correlation is annotated with that cell type. The proteins were binned into 5 categories depending on their percentage missing values. When two proteins are included in the same bin, their correlation is flagged with that bin.

Although imputation methods can and are applied to SCP data, their suitability still needs to be demonstrated. Computational benchmarking efforts are required to pinpoint the limitations of these imputation methods on SCP data, but also to assess the practical significance of the limitations associated with imputation compared to data modelling.

We advise that future computational developments consider 5 main challenges when dealing with missing values. First, the proportion of missing values is high. Most datasets have over 70 % missing entries at the peptide level. At these rates of missing values, several imputation methods fail to provide accurate predictions [2]. Second, there is a diversity of experimental approaches to SCP. Each approach has its strengths and weaknesses and leads to different missing data patterns. Different algorithms might be necessary to deal with each pattern, and we do not expect that an algorithm that performs best for one type of data will perform best for all types of data. Therefore, future computational innovation must clearly state on which type of data they were tested and are expected to be best suited. Third, the imputation methods should take into account that every single cell is unique and that replicates are not available. This will require new methods to evaluate the sweet spot between over-fitting and over-smoothing. Fourth, SCP inevitably imposes large-scale experiments. Therefore, batch effects are and will be present in SCP data [10]. We cannot imagine a successful method that handles missing values without handling batch effects as well. Finally, missing values may be deterministic and/or stochastic, and distinguishing the two mechanisms may avoid bias in the data analysis. However, to what extent the bias impacts downstream analyses still requires thorough investigation for SCP data.

We provide a few recommendations targeted toward SCP practitioners. First, we recommend reporting at least four metrics when reporting the sensitivity of an experiment. The local sensitivity provides information about the number of features that are detected in a single cell. Total sensitivity provides information about the number of features that are potentially detectable in the experiment. The data completeness provides the global agreement between the sets of features identified across cells. The number of cells acquired during the experiment provides essential information because total sensitivity and data consistency require enough cells to be correctly estimated. We recommend not interpreting these metrics when less than 100 cells are acquired, and suggest using a cumulative sensitivity plot to assess whether the number of cells allows for an accurate estimation of the total sensitivity. Reporting the pairwise Jaccard index provides also useful information about data consistency. We provide functions to compute the suggested metrics in the `scp` R/Bioconductor package [10]. A tutorial showing how to compute these metrics is available on the package's webpage.¹ We also recommend providing at least 3 pieces of information when reporting the approach used to deal with missing values: the name of the algorithm, the name of the software, and the version of the software. We also strongly recommend providing the code and the software environment to reproduce any published results. This recommendation is not new and was already presented previously [46]. We however provide a comprehensive example showing that small variations in applying an imputation method can have a significant impact on the processed data and downstream analyses. Finally, we raise concerns regarding how missing values are encoded. We recommend encoding missing values using an appropriate data type rather than a numeric value (e.g. `NA` for R and `numpy.nan` for Python).

The field of SCP is rapidly expanding [53], but it craves for adequate solutions to deal with missing data. This represents a great opportunity for computational biologists and bioinformaticians that want to join the exciting advances of SCP.

Acknowledgment

This preprint was created using the LaPreprint template (<https://github.com/roaldarbol/lapreprint>) by Mikkel Roald-Arbøl .

We thank Lieven Clement, Davide Risso, Charlotte Soneson and the members of the CBIO lab

¹https://uclouvain-cbio.github.io/scp/articles/reporting_missing_values.html

for useful discussions about scRNA-Seq and proteomics data imputation.

Author contributions

Conceptualization: L.G.; Methodology: C.V., L.G.; Software: C.V., L.G.; Formal analysis: C.V.; Writing - original draft: C.V., L.G.; Writing - review & editing: L.G.; Visualization: C.V.; Supervision: L.G.; Project administration: L.G.; Funding acquisition: L.G.

References

- [1] Jiayu Peng, Jungpil Hahn, and Ke-Wei Huang. "Handling Missing Values in Information Systems Research: A Review of Methods and Assumptions". In: *Information Systems Research* 34.1 (2023), pp. 5–26.
- [2] Weijia Kong et al. "Dealing with missing values in proteomics data". In: *Proteomics* 22.23-24 (2022), e2200092.
- [3] Lisa M Bramer et al. "A Review of Imputation Strategies for Isobaric Labeling-Based Shotgun Proteomics". In: *J. Proteome Res.* 20.1 (2021), pp. 1–13.
- [4] Kruttika Dabke et al. "A Simple Optimization Workflow to Enable Precise and Accurate Imputation of Missing Values in Proteomic Data Sets". In: *J. Proteome Res.* 20.6 (2021), pp. 3214–3229.
- [5] Manuel Matzinger, Rupert L Mayer, and Karl Mechtler. "Label-Free Single Cell Proteomics Utilizing Ultrafast LC and MS Instrumentation: A Valuable Complementary Technique to Multiplexing". In: *Proteomics* (2023), e2200162.
- [6] Valdemaras Petrosius and Erwin M Schoof. "Recent advances in the field of single-cell proteomics". In: *Transl. Oncol.* 27 (2022), p. 101556.
- [7] Nikolai Slavov. "Single-cell protein analysis by mass spectrometry". In: *Curr. Opin. Chem. Biol.* 60 (2021), pp. 1–9.
- [8] Claudia Ctorteka and Karl Mechtler. "The rise of single-cell proteomics". In: *Analytical Science Advances* 2.3-4 (2021), pp. 84–94.
- [9] Ryan T Kelly. "Single-cell Proteomics: Progress and Prospects". In: *Mol. Cell. Proteomics* 19.11 (2020), pp. 1739–1748.
- [10] Christophe Vanderaa and Laurent Gatto. "Replication of single-cell proteomics data reveals important computational challenges". In: *Expert Rev. Proteomics* 18.10 (2021), pp. 835–843.
- [11] Jason Derks and Nikolai Slavov. "Strategies for Increasing the Depth and Throughput of Protein Analysis by plexDIA". In: *J. Proteome Res.* 22.3 (2023), pp. 697–705.
- [12] Nikolai Slavov. "Driving Single Cell Proteomics Forward with Innovation". In: *J. Proteome Res.* 20.11 (2021), pp. 4915–4918.
- [13] Harrison Specht and Nikolai Slavov. "Transformative Opportunities for Single-Cell Proteomics". In: *J. Proteome Res.* 17.8 (2018), pp. 2565–2571.
- [14] Luke Zappia and Fabian J Theis. "Over 1000 tools reveal trends in the single-cell RNA-seq analysis landscape". In: *Genome Biol.* 22.1 (2021), p. 301.
- [15] Rebecca C Poulos et al. "Strategies to enable large-scale proteomics for reproducible research". In: *Nat. Commun.* 11.1 (2020), p. 3793.
- [16] Christophe Vanderaa and Laurent Gatto. "The Current State of Single-Cell Proteomics Data Analysis". In: *Curr Protoc* 3.1 (2023), e658.
- [17] Andreas-David Brunner et al. "Ultra-high sensitivity mass spectrometry quantifies single-cell proteome changes upon perturbation". In: *Mol. Syst. Biol.* 18.3 (2022), e10798.

- [18] Jason Derks et al. "Increasing the throughput of sensitive proteomics by plexDIA". In: *Nat. Biotechnol.* 41.1 (2023), pp. 50–59.
- [19] Maowei Dou et al. "High-Throughput Single Cell Proteomics Enabled by Multiplex Isobaric Labeling in a Nanodroplet Sample Preparation Platform". In: *Anal. Chem.* 91.20 (2019), pp. 13119–13127.
- [20] Andrew Leduc et al. "Exploring functional protein covariation across single cells using nPOP". In: *Genome Biol.* 23.1 (2022), p. 261.
- [21] Yiran Liang et al. "Fully Automated Sample Processing and Analysis Workflow for Low-Input Proteome Profiling". In: *Anal. Chem.* 93.3 (2021), pp. 1658–1666.
- [22] Erwin M Schoof et al. "Quantitative single-cell proteomics as a tool to characterize cellular hierarchies". In: *Nat. Commun.* 12.1 (2021), p. 745679.
- [23] Harrison Specht et al. "Single-cell proteomic and transcriptomic analysis of macrophage heterogeneity using SCoPE2". In: *Genome Biol.* 22.1 (2021), p. 50.
- [24] Ying Zhu et al. "Single-cell proteomics reveals changes in expression during hair-cell development". In: *Elife* 8 (2019), e50777.
- [25] Lincoln Harris et al. "Evaluating proteomics imputation methods with improved criteria". Preprint, DOI: 10.1101/2023.04.07.535980. 2023.
- [26] Jing Qi et al. "scMTD: a statistical multidimensional imputation method for single-cell RNA-seq data leveraging transcriptome dynamic information". In: *Cell Biosci.* 12.1 (2022), p. 142.
- [27] Wenpin Hou et al. "A systematic evaluation of single-cell RNA-sequencing imputation methods". In: *Genome Biol.* 21.1 (2020), p. 218.
- [28] Jonathon J O'Brien et al. "The effects of nonignorable missing data on label-free mass spectrometry proteomics experiments". In: *Ann. Appl. Stat.* 12.4 (2018), pp. 2075–2095.
- [29] Ludger J E Goeminne et al. "MSqRob Takes the Missing Hurdle: Uniting Intensity- and Count-Based Proteomics". In: *Anal. Chem.* 92.9 (2020), pp. 6278–6287.
- [30] Ana Carolina Leote, Xiaohui Wu, and Andreas Beyer. "Regulatory network-based imputation of dropouts in single-cell RNA sequencing data". In: *PLoS Comput. Biol.* 18.2 (2022), e1009849.
- [31] Duc Tran et al. "A novel method for single-cell data imputation using subspace regression". In: *Sci. Rep.* 12.1 (2022), p. 2697.
- [32] Wuming Gong et al. "DrImpute: imputing dropout events in single cell RNA sequencing data". In: *BMC Bioinformatics* 19.1 (2018), p. 220.
- [33] Q Giai Gianetto et al. "A peptide-level multiple imputation strategy accounting for the different natures of missing values in proteomics data". Preprint, DOI: 10.1101/2020.05.29.122770. 2020.
- [34] Marie Chion, Christine Carapito, and Frédéric Bertrand. "Accounting for multiple imputation-induced variability for differential analysis in mass spectrometry-based label-free quantitative proteomics". In: *PLoS Comput. Biol.* 18.8 (2022), e1010420.
- [35] Cosmin Lazar et al. "Accounting for the Multiple Natures of Missing Values in Label-Free Quantitative Proteomics Data Sets to Compare Imputation Strategies". In: *J. Proteome Res.* 15.4 (2016), pp. 1116–1125.
- [36] Robert A Amezcua et al. "Orchestrating single-cell analysis with Bioconductor". In: *Nat. Methods* 17.2 (2020), pp. 137–145.
- [37] Malte D Luecken and Fabian J Theis. "Current best practices in single-cell RNA-seq analysis: a tutorial". In: *Mol. Syst. Biol.* 15.6 (2019), e8746.

- [38] Julie Josse and François Husson. “missMDA: A Package for Handling Missing Values in Multivariate Data Analysis”. In: *J. Stat. Softw.* 70 (2016), pp. 1–31.
- [39] Davide Risso et al. “A general and flexible method for signal extraction from single-cell RNA-seq data”. In: *Nat. Commun.* 9.1 (2018), p. 284.
- [40] Romain Lopez et al. “Deep generative modeling for single-cell transcriptomics”. In: *Nat. Methods* 15.12 (2018), pp. 1053–1058.
- [41] Koen Van den Berge et al. “Observation weights unlock bulk RNA-seq tools for zero inflation and single-cell applications”. In: *Genome Biol.* 19.1 (2018), p. 24.
- [42] Luyi Tian et al. “Benchmarking single cell RNA-sequencing analysis pipelines using mixture control experiments”. In: *Nat. Methods* 16.6 (2019), pp. 479–487.
- [43] Trevor Hastie et al. *Imputing Missing Data for Gene Expression Arrays*. Tech. rep. Stanford Statistics Department, 2001.
- [44] Bobbie-Jo M Webb-Robertson et al. “Review, evaluation, and discussion of the challenges of missing value imputation for mass spectrometry-based label-free global proteomics”. In: *J. Proteome Res.* 14.5 (2015), pp. 1993–2001.
- [45] R Gray Huffman et al. “Prioritized mass spectrometry increases the depth, sensitivity and data completeness of single-cell proteomics”. In: *Nat. Methods* (2023), p. 2022.03.16.484655.
- [46] Laurent Gatto et al. “Initial recommendations for performing, benchmarking and reporting single-cell proteomics experiments”. In: *Nat. Methods* 20.3 (2023), pp. 375–386.
- [47] David van Dijk et al. “Recovering Gene Interactions from Single-Cell Data Using Data Diffusion”. In: *Cell* 174.3 (2018), 716–729.e27.
- [48] Mengbo Li and Gordon K Smyth. “Neither random nor censored: estimating intensity-dependent probabilities for missing values in label-free proteomics”. In: *Bioinformatics* 39.5 (2023).
- [49] Constantin Ahlmann-Eltze and Simon Anders. “proDA: Probabilistic Dropout Analysis for Identifying Differentially Abundant Proteins in Label-Free Mass Spectrometry”. Preprint, DOI: 10.1101/661420. 2020.
- [50] Hannah Boekweg and Samuelh Payne. “Challenges and opportunities for single cell computational proteomics”. In: *Mol. Cell. Proteomics* (2023), p. 100518.
- [51] Kei G I Webber et al. “Label-Free Profiling of up to 200 Single-Cell Proteomes per Day Using a Dual-Column Nanoflow Liquid Chromatography Platform”. In: *Anal. Chem.* 94.15 (2022), pp. 6017–6025.
- [52] Jongmin Woo et al. “Three-dimensional feature matching improves coverage for single-cell proteomics based on ion mobility filtering”. In: *Cell Syst* 13.5 (2022), 426–434.e4.
- [53] “Single-cell proteomics: challenges and prospects”. In: *Nat. Methods* 20.3 (2023), pp. 317–318.